



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,936	11/04/2003	Randy S. Bethel	VPI/02-123 US	5983
27916	7590	01/13/2006	EXAMINER	
VERTEX PHARMACEUTICALS INC. 130 WAVERLY STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4242			HABTE, KAHSAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/700,936	BETHIEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kahsay Habte	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24, 26, 28 and 29 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 26, 28 and 29 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/16/2005</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-24, 26 and 28-29 are pending in this application. Since the product was found allowable, the method claims 26 and 28-29 (Group V) are rejoined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendment filed 12/08/2005 in response to the previous Office Action (07/05/2005) is acknowledged. Rejections of claims 2, 7, 12 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph (items 8a-8c) have been obviated.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 26 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of a disease or disorder selected from an allergic or type I hypersensitivity reaction, asthma, transplant rejection, graft versus host disease, rheumatoid arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of leukemia or a method of inhibiting JAK-3 kinase activity in a biological sample. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A number of factors are relevant to whether undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed invention, including "(1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims." In re Wands, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The scope of the claims is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity related to CDK2 or JAK-3 kinase activity provided in the specification. Test procedures to find the  $K_i$  and  $EC_{50}$  values of the compounds with respect to ligand binding activity are provided in the specification in Examples 16-18, however, there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this data correlates to the treatment of leukemia. Leukemia is classified according to how quickly the abnormal changes happen and by the type of blood cell that is affected.

**Acute leukemia** gets worse quickly, with fast multiplication of abnormal, immature blood cells called blasts.

**Chronic leukemia** worsens gradually. Abnormal cells are present, but they are more mature than they are in acute leukemia and can carry out at least some of their functions. However, they do not fight infection as well as normal white blood cells do. Also, they tend to live much longer than normal white blood cells, which results in an abnormal accumulation of cells.

**Lymphocytic leukemia** affects the white blood cells called lymphocytes, which control the body's immune response by finding and destroying foreign substances.

**Myelogenous leukemia** affects other kinds of white blood cells in the bone marrow, called granulocytes or monocytes. These help protect the body against bacteria and infections.

The disorders encompassed by the instant claims are different one from the other, some of which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. There is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 1 51 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

Further, the claim 28 is not limited to JAK-3 kinases. Thus, factors such as 'sufficient working examples', 'the level of skill in the art' and 'predictability', etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

In regard to the method for inhibiting JAK-3 kinase activity in a biological sample, the specification is not enabled for such scope. What is JAK-3 kinase activity? Who is

need of this method? Applicants have amended this claim from “a method of inhibiting JAK-3 kinase activity in a patient or biological sample” to “a method of inhibiting JAK-3 kinase activity in a biological sample”, but this won’t change the scope of the claim. Any sample e.g. blood or urine from a patient is a biological sample. It is recommended that applicants delete claim 26.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 25, the phrase “inhibiting JAK-3 kinase activity in a biological sample” is not clear? Who is in need of this inhibition and who is not? Why do we need this inhibition? What is considered a biological sample? How is this different from inhibiting JA-3 kinase activity in a patient?

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte whose telephone number is (571) 272-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00AM- 5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1624

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kahsay Habte  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624

January 12, 2006